

## REMARKS

Claim 1, 17, and 34 have been amended. Claims 43, 91, and 96 - 98 have been cancelled herein (and Claims 2 - 8, 10, 12 - 13, 16, 19, 25 - 27, 29 - 33, 35 - 36, 38 - 42, 44 - 89, and 92 - 95 have been previously cancelled from the application). Claims 99 - 115 have been added. No new matter has been introduced with these amendments or added claims, all of which are supported in the specification as originally filed. Claims 1, 9, 11, 14 - 15, 17 - 18, 20 - 24, 28, 34, 37, 90, and 99 - 115 are now in the application.

This Preliminary Amendment responds to the Office Action dated September 1, 2006 (hereinafter, "the Office Action") and to the Advisory Action dated November 14, 2006 (hereinafter, "the Advisory Action").

I. Rejection Under 35 U. S. C. §112, second paragraph

Paragraph 4 of the Office Action states that Claims 1, 9, 11, 14 - 15, 17 - 18, 20 - 24, 28 and 90 are rejected under 35 U. S. C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Appropriate corrections have been made herein to independent Claim 1.

Paragraph 5 of the Office Action states that Claims 96 - 98 are also rejected under 35 U. S. C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. These claims have been cancelled from the application, rendering the rejection moot as to those claims.

In view of the above, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the §112, second

paragraph rejection.

## II. Rejection Under 35 U. S. C. §102(a)

Paragraph 7 of the Office Action states that Claims 34 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by U. S. Patent 6,975,988 B1 to Roth. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants have amended independent Claim 34 herein to clarify limitations thereof. As now presented, lines 4 - 6 of Claim 34 recite “identifying, by the caller using the telephone device during the step of creating the voice mail message, a plurality of message segments for segmenting the voice mail message;” (emphasis added). Applicants respectfully submit that Roth has no teaching, nor any suggestion, of a caller identifying voice message segments using the telephone device. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 34 is not anticipated by Roth. Dependent Claim 37 therefore deemed patentable by virtue of (*inter alia*) the patentability of Claim 34, from which it depends.

In view of the above, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the §102 rejection.

## III. Rejection Under 35 U. S. C. §103(a)

Paragraph 10 of the Office Action states that Claims 96 - 98 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U. S. Patent 6,407,325 to Yi. These claims have been

cancelled from the application, rendering this rejection moot.

IV. Allowable Subject Matter

Paragraph 11 of the Office Action states that Claims 1, 9, 11, 14 - 15, 17 - 18, 20 - 24, 28 and 90 would be allowable if amended to overcome the 35 U. S. C. §112, second paragraph rejection. As noted above, corrections have been made to Claim 1, and Applicants respectfully submit that, with these corrections, Claims 1, 9, 11, 14 - 15, 17 - 18, 20 - 24, 28 and 90 are allowable.

V. Added Claims

Applicants have added Claims 99 - 115. Dependent Claim 99 is deemed patentable by virtue of (at least) the allowability of Claim 1, from which it depends. Independent Claim 100 is a system claim that specifies limitations analogous to those of allowable method Claim 1, and independent Claim 111 is a computer program product specifying analogous limitations. Accordingly, Claims 100 and 111 are deemed patentable over the references. Added independent Claim 114 is a system claim that specifies limitations analogous to those in independent Claim 34, and is deemed patentable for the same reasons discussed above with regard to Claim 34.

VI. Previously-Submitted Declaration of Fact Under 37 C.F.R. §1.131

The Advisory Action states that the previously-submitted Declaration of Fact Under 37 C.F.R. §1.131 (hereinafter, "the Affidavit") is defective for various reasons. Applicants respectfully submit that the Affidavit is not necessary for distinguishing their claimed invention

from Roth, and hereby respectfully request that the Affidavit be withdrawn or that, in the alternative, the Affidavit not be further considered.

VII. Conclusion

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the pending rejected claims, withdrawal of all presently outstanding rejections, and allowance of all remaining claims at an early date.

Respectfully submitted,

/Marcia L. Doubet/ /#40,999/

Marcia L. Doubet, Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 40,999

Customer Number for Correspondence: 43168

Phone: 407-343-7586

Fax: 407-343-7587